IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1958.

No. 372

PAUL GINSBURG,

Petitioner,

vs.

HON. PHILIP L. SULLIVAN, JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION, AND HON. ROY H. JOHNSON, CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION,

Respondents.

ANSWER TO PETITION FOR CERTIORARI.

GEORGE B. CHRISTENSEN,
THOMAS A. REYNOLDS,
Attorneys for Respondents.

WINSTON, STRAWN, SMITH & PATTERSON,
38 South Dearborn Street,
Chicago, Illinois,
Of Counsel.

THE LAWYERS PRINTING CO., CHICAGO

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1958.

No. 372.

PAUL GINSBURG,

Petitioner,

vs.

HON. PHILIP L. SULLIVAN, JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION, AND HON. ROY H. JOHNSON, CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION,

Respondents.

ANSWER TO PETITION FOR CERTIORARI.

To the Honorable, the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

The petition for certiorari is founded upon the assumption that the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit should have issued a writ of mandamus to the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, requiring it to receive, on June 12, 1958, and to pass upon an amendment to a complaint in a case (*Ginsburg v. Black, et al.*) in which final judgment had been entered against petitioner on July 1, 1955, and subsequently affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in 237 F. 2d 790. Certiorari therein was denied by this Court May 6, 1957

(353 U. S. 911, 951). Subsequent to the denial of certiorari petitioner filed sundry and scandalous petitions in the nature of petitions for rehearing, both in and out of term time, all of which were denied by this Court. In the face of as final an adjudication as our law provides, petitioner endeavored to revive the case in the District Court with an amended complaint. That Court had long since lost jurisdiction. No case was before it in which an amendment could be made.

The Court of Appeals properly denied mandamus, and it is respectfully submitted that no cause for certiorari exists.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE B. CHRISTENSEN,
THOMAS A. REYNOLDS,
Attorneys for Respondents.

WINSTON, STRAWN, SMITH & PATTERSON,
38 South Dearborn Street,
Chicago, Illinois,
Of Counsel.

October 27, 1958.